

Orange County Public Schools

Rolling Hills Elementary



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 11 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Rolling Hills Elementary

4903 DONOVAN ST, Orlando, FL 32808

<https://rollinghillses.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Farah Henderson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities |
| School Grade | 2018-19: B |
| School Grades History | 2017-18: D 2016-17: B 2015-16: F 2014-15: F 2013-14: C |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Diane Leinenbach |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Henderson, Farah | Principal | |
| Williams, Michele | Instructional Coach | |
| Holiday, Valencia | Instructional Coach | |
| Issertell, Harriett | Instructional Coach | |
| Tondreau-Demosthenes, Natasha | Other | Staffing Specialist. |
| Bawden, Korey | Assistant Principal | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 | 29 | 26 | 23 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 6 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 3 | 6 | 4 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/17/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 28 | 29 | 21 | 29 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 55 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 4 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 28 | 29 | 21 | 29 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 55 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 4 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 38% | 57% | 57% | 28% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | 58% | 58% | 38% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | 52% | 53% | 37% | 48% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 51% | 63% | 63% | 30% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 71% | 61% | 62% | 43% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 68% | 48% | 51% | 42% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 56% | 56% | 53% | 31% | 55% | 55% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 (28) | 29 (29) | 26 (21) | 23 (29) | 20 (7) | 11 (11) | 136 (125) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (2) | 3 (4) | 5 (4) | 5 (7) | 6 (15) | 6 (10) | 26 (42) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 6 (4) | 5 (2) | 7 (3) | 2 (5) | 1 (8) | 3 (1) | 24 (23) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 45 (58) | 31 (55) | 24 (26) | 100 (139) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 25% | 55% | -30% | 58% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 55% | -32% | 57% | -34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 39% | 57% | -18% | 58% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 16% | 54% | -38% | 56% | -40% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 23% | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 45% | 54% | -9% | 56% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 55% | -22% | 55% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 29% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 47% | 62% | -15% | 62% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 25% | 61% | -36% | 62% | -37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 22% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 52% | 63% | -11% | 64% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 20% | 62% | -42% | 62% | -42% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 32% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 27% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 46% | 57% | -11% | 60% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 59% | -17% | 61% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 26% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 53% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 53% | -25% | 55% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 25% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 26 | 39 | | 40 | 61 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 66 | | 49 | 72 | 73 | 43 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 59 | 65 | 51 | 71 | 72 | 57 | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 67 | | 42 | 65 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 61 | 66 | 47 | 73 | 73 | 57 | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 29 | 50 | | 21 | 44 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 44 | | 27 | 22 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 33 | 33 | 27 | 42 | 45 | 24 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 69 | | 52 | 57 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 39 | 39 | 30 | 46 | 43 | 29 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 51 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 460 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

English Language Learners

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 56 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Asian Students

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Black/African American Students

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 57 |
|---|----|

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 59 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 57 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

The ELA achievement at Rolling Hills was 38% for the 2019 assessment period. This is 10% higher than the 2018 assessment period.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

All data components at Rolling Hills increased for the 2019 assessment period.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

ELA achievement had the largest gap when compared to the state for the 2019 assessment period. The state reports an overall proficiency level in ELA achievement at 56%; whereas, Rolling Hills performed at a proficiency level of 28%, which shows a 19% differential. Incoming 3rd-grade students are not showing proficiency in reading according to the iReady diagnostics.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% has shown the most improvement from the 2017-18 school year to the 2018-19 school year. In 2018, 43% of our lowest 25% showed a learning gain. In 2019, the students showed a 28% increase with 71% of our lowest 25% showing a learning gain. The school identified the lowest 25% from the beginning of the school year and focused on increasing mastery through differentiated instruction with small groups.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

There are 69 students at Rolling Hills with two or more early warning indicators.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Culture within the staff and community.
2. ELA proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | Increase student achievement by cultivating positive staff and community culture to support student success in all areas. |
| Rationale | <p>Based on the 2018-2019 AdvanceEd Survey, 76% of parents state that the teachers help them to understand their students' progress and 77% of our teachers said that all school personnel regularly engage families in their children's learning progress.</p> <p>By continuing to focus on cultivating positive staff and community culture we will continue to increase the dialogue among all stakeholders regarding the students' academic and social/emotional progress. Through this process, the students will see an increase in student achievement.</p> |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By cultivating positive staff and community culture, 80% of our parents will state that the teachers help them to understand their students' progress and 81% of our teachers will state that school personnel regularly engage families in their children's learning progress. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff will participate in various professional development throughout the year with a focus on cultivating positive relationships and culture within the classroom 2. Instructional coaches will lead and promote positive common planning and data meetings 3. The teachers will develop culturally responsive lesson plans and instructional activities 4. Provide support for teachers through the coaching cycle 5. Increase communication with parents via phone, email, and social media 6. Coaches provide updates on common planning at resource team meetings and provide ongoing support 7. Indicators and ratings from the BPIE will be shared with the faculty 8. In response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities, professional development will be held school-wide to increase positive academic conversations and differentiation to increase student achievement 9. Develop culturally responsive lessons and learning activities |

**Person
Responsible**

Farah Henderson (farah.henderson@ocps.net)

| | |
|------------------|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | ELA Proficiency. |
| Rationale | The overall school proficiency rate for ELA is 38%. Based on 2018-2019 FSA Reading scores 3rd Grade had 25% of students score a level 3 or higher, 4th Grade had 39% of students score a level 3 or higher, and 5th grade had 45% of students score a level 3 or higher. Through strategies learned in our DPLC, we will continue to focus on close reading and text-dependent questioning, allowing students to engage with the text in a variety of ways, reflect as they read, and draw conclusions based on evidence from the text. This professional development will increase overall comprehension, leading to increased student learning gains. |

| | |
|--|---|
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | By collaboratively planning and implementing strategies learned at the DPLC (year 3), the intended outcome is to increase ELA proficiency by 10% to 35%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | By focusing on collaborative lesson planning and an intense focus on close reading (year 3), teachers will have the opportunity to plan for more rigorous reading lessons. The team will focus efforts on helping teachers identify text that is appropriate for close reading (quantitative, qualitative, reader and task), by having them bring exemplary samples for ELA (with content integration). |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Students use of conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge. This will be monitored through class observations of students working in small groups. |

Action Step

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coaches will model lessons that incorporate close reading strategies in the classroom. 2. Teachers will have the opportunity to complete peer observations, focused on close reading strategies and student monitoring. 3. Implement the use of culturally diverse texts and deliberate questioning techniques when planning standards-aligned lessons and units. 4. To address the culturally responsive school plan an administrative lead will oversee and monitor MAO initiatives such as monthly progress monitoring meeting with initiative leads, quarterly reviews, provide actionable feedback, ensure leads are accountable and meet deadlines and provide the principal with bi-monthly 5. DPLC team provides professional development to new teachers (overview of year one and two) 6. DPLC site team continues to offer professional development geared towards differentiated instruction within small groups. 7. Coaches provide updates on common planning at leadership team meetings and provide ongoing differentiated support for teachers. |
|--------------------|---|

8. Administration will meet bi-weekly with coaches to review their coaching logs, classroom walkthroughs, and PLC meetings.
9. Administration will conduct routine walkthroughs focused on the delivery and classroom monitoring of the ELA Florida Standards.

Person Responsible Farah Henderson (farah.henderson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

The Parent Engagement Liason (PEL) and school administration work hand in hand to build positive relationships with all stakeholders. Numerous activities are held throughout the year including parent-student breakfasts, FSA night, STEM/Science night, and various concerts. To help increase parental involvement, the school will use multiple methods of communication.

The PEL and administration are supporting the involvement of the PTO at Rolling Hills Elementary School. The PTO's goal is to foster a nurturing and caring environment that strives for continued parent involvement which helps build a better educational environment for our children.

Parents, teachers and community members are encouraged to participate on the SAC and PTA. Additionally, they are encouraged to volunteer in different activities so they are engaged in their children's' academic day.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Rolling Hills uses multiple strategies to support the social-emotional needs of all students. The school ensures that the social-emotional needs of all students are being met through the use of classroom meetings, a full-time guidance counselor who conducts social skills groups, and two Devereux Counselors who provide onsite counseling five days per week.

Learning for Life is used with students Pre-K through 5. Learning for Life is an integrated academic and character development program which features grade-specific, theme-oriented lesson plans to be used in the classroom to enhance and support the core curriculum. The program is an action learning process which uses engaging techniques, such as role-playing, small group discussion, moral dilemma exercises, online interactive lessons, and hands-on activities.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Rolling Hills Elementary has one regular-education Pre-K unit. The Florida Kindergarten Readiness test (FLKRS) is administered to all kindergarten students. All incoming kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering kindergarten in order to gain individual and group needs and to assist in the development of their instructional/intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of basic skills and school readiness.

Meet the Teacher is held before school starts so that students can meet their teacher and get acquainted with their classroom and school surroundings. Open House gives parent's the opportunity to come into the classroom and learn more about the schedule of the school day and all of the activities that their child will do. Middle School field trips are scheduled to prepare outgoing 5th-grade students for secondary academics. Fifth-grade students meet with feeder middle school guidance counselors to help with schedules and classes of interest.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Rolling Hills MTSS team meets bi-monthly focusing on core curriculum areas and tiered support that includes methods of instruction, school based-curriculum, and the classroom setting to continually increase student progress and achievement. The team focuses on disaggregation of the data, grade-level instructional focus calendars, instructional pacing, and differentiated instruction. The team also evaluates the effectiveness of the interventions determining continued implementation or modification.

The instructional coaches provide and model best practices in instructional strategies in order to increase student achievement and assist with monitoring data. In addition, instructional coaches provide professional development.

The Staffing Specialist assists in gathering data and working with the exceptional education teachers in tracking exceptional education student data as well as providing strategies, resources, and materials for students making minimal learning gains in the regular education setting. The Staffing Specialist also monitors the progress and implementation of interventions and strategies school-wide and provides ongoing professional development.

The Curriculum Compliance Teacher monitors the progress and implementation of interventions and strategies for identified ELL students ensuring intervention plans remain ESOL compliant.

The School Psychologist provides historical data on students, assessment support when determined, assessment tools to gauge student progress as a result of interventions, intervention techniques and practices, and various intervention plans.

The Social Worker provides support (financial, medical, etc.) to identified students' families with various resources from a plethora of community agencies.

The Dean and Behavior Specialist work to provide support to identified students exhibiting behavioral concerns. They monitor student progress, behavioral interventions, and provide teachers with strategies, resources and professional development to increase student engagement and on-task behaviors.

The Student Support Teacher works in conjunction with the discipline team to provide interventions and referrals for identified students.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Rolling Hills provides a variety of professional development opportunities as well as parent workshops for both teachers and parents on a quarterly basis to improve the school/home relationship for grades 3-5. College spirit day will be celebrated weekly on Friday. We also established Smart Goals which are specific, measurable, action-oriented, reasonable, and timely in order to foster an environment where the mindset is all students are college-bound. Teachers will incorporate rigorous, relevant, differentiated opportunities in all content areas for all students in all classrooms. We also participate in Teach-In and Junior Achievement. During Teach-In, Rolling Hills brings in outside businesses, partners and civic organizations to expose students in a meaningful and engaging environment.